IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

Document 7

| | § | |
|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| TRISTAN NOAH BENEFIELD, | 8 | |
| D1 : .:.00 | 8 | |
| Plaintiff, | 8 | |
| | 8 | |
| V. | § | Case No. 6:24-cv-464-JDK-KNM |
| | § | |
| ATHENS POLICE DEPARTMENT, | § | |
| | § | |
| Defendant. | § | |
| | § | |

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff Tristan Noah Benefield filed this lawsuit on December 11, 2024. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition. The Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the complaint be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. Docket No. 5. Mail sent to Plaintiff at the address he provided was returned with the notation, "not deliverable as addressed." Docket No. 6. Plaintiff is responsible for keeping the Court advised of his current physical address. Local Rule CV-11(d). No written objections have been filed.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc),

superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 5) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for failure to prosecute. FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b).

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 25th day of February, 2025.

JEREMY D. KERNODLE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE